arXiv:1403.0575v2 [cond-mat.str-el] 26 Dec 2014

Unification of bosonic and fermionic theories of spin liquids on the kagome lattice

Yuan-Ming Lu,[1,2] Gil Young Cho,[1,3] and Ashvin Vishwanath[1,2]

[1]*Department of Physics, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720*
[2]*Materials Sciences Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA 94720*
[3]*Department of Physics, Institute for Condensed Matter Theory, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, IL 61801*

(Dated: December 30, 2014)

Recent numerical studies have provided strong evidence for a gapped Z_2 quantum spin liquid in the kagome lattice Heisenberg model. A special feature of spin liquids is that symmetries can be fractionalized, and different patterns of fractionalization imply distinct phases. The symmetry fractionalization pattern for the kagome spin liquid remains to be determined. A popular approach to studying spin liquids is to decompose the physical spin into partons which are either bosonic (Schwinger bosons) or fermionic (Abrikosov fermions), which are then treated within mean field theory. A longstanding question has been whether these two approaches are truly distinct or describe the same phase in complementary ways. Here we show that all 8 spin liquid phases in Schwinger boson representation can also be described in terms of Abrikosov fermions, unifying pairs of theories that seem rather distinct. The key idea is that for kagome lattice states that admit a Schwinger boson mean field (SBMF) description, the symmetry action on visions is uniquely fixed. Two promising candidate states for kagome Heisenberg model, Sachdev's $Q_1 = Q_2$ SBMF state and Lu-Ran-Lee's $Z_2[0,\pi]\beta$ fermionic parton state, are found to describe the same spin liquid phase. We expect these results to aid in a complete specification of the numerically observed spin liquid phase. We also discuss a set of fermionic parton phases, where spin rotation, time reversal and kagome lattice symmetries protect gapless edge states, that do not admit a SBMF representation .

PACS numbers:

I. INTRODUCTION

Z_2 spin liquids (SLs) are a class of disordered many-spin states which have a finite energy gap for all bulk excitations. They differ fundamentally from symmetry breaking groundstates such as magnetically ordered phases and valence bond solids, since, in their simplest form, they preserve all the symmetries including spin rotation, time reversal and crystal symmetries. More importantly they possess bulk quasiparticles carrying fractional statistics[1]. For example in the most common Z_2 SL , there are three distinct types of fractionalized bulk excitations[2–7]: *bosonic spinon* b with half-integer spin, *fermionic spinon* f with half-integer spin and *bosonic vison* v (a vortex excitation of Z_2 gauge theory) with integer spin. They all obey mutual semion statistics[7]: *i.e.* a bosonic spinon acquires a -1 Berry phase when it adiabatically encircles a fermionic spinon or a vison. These statistical properties are identical to those of excitations in Z_2 gauge theory[8], hence the name "Z_2 spin liquid".

Recently, interest in Z_2 SLs has been recharged by numerical studies on the spin-1/2 Heisenberg model on kagome[9–12] lattice, where this state is strongly indicated. In particular a topological entanglement entropy[13,14] of $\gamma = \log 2$ is observed in the ground state. Just like local order parameters are used to describe symmetry breaking phases[15], here fractional statistics and topological entanglement entropy serve as fingerprints of topological order[16] in Z_2 spin liquids. Analogous results have been reported for the frustrated square lattice, although the correlation lengths in that case are not as small as in the kagome lattice[17,18].

Intriguingly, the experimentally studied spin-1/2 kagome materials - such as herbertsmithite[19] - also remain quantum disordered down to the lowest temperature scales studied, well below the exchange energy scales. However, in contrast to the numerical studies, it does not appear to be gapped. It is currently unclear if the gaplessness is an intrinsic feature or a consequence of impurities that are known to be present in these materials. Furthermore the magnetic Hamiltonian of the material may depart from the pure Heisenberg limit. Relating the numerical results to experiments remains an important open question.

Since it preserves all symmetries of the system, is a Z_2 SL fully characterized by its topological order? The answer is no. In fact, the interplay of symmetry and topological order leads to a very rich structure. There are many different Z_2 spin liquids with the same Z_2 topological order and the same symmetry group, but they cannot be continuously connected to each other without breaking the symmetry: they are dubbed "symmetry enriched topological (SET)" phases[20–26]. In a SET phase the quasiparticles not only have fractional statistics, but can also carry fractional symmetry quantum numbers: different SET phases are characterized by different patterns of symmetry fractionalization[23].

In the literature Z_2 SLs have been constructed in various slave-particle frameworks: the most predominant

two approaches fractionalize physical spins into bosonic spinons[2,27–29] and fermionic spinons[3,5,20,30–33]. Both approaches yield variational wavefunctions with good energetics[34–36] for the kagome lattice model. It was proposed that symmetric Z_2 SLs are classified by the projective symmetry groups[20] (PSGs) of bosonic/fermionic spinons. However it has been a long-time puzzle to understand the relation between different PSGs in bosonic-spinon representation (bSR) and fermionic-spinon representations (fSR)[37]. To be specific in the kagome lattice Heisenberg model, in bSR (Schwinger-boson approach) there are 8 different Z_2 SLs[29] among which the so-called $Q_1 = Q_2$ state[28] is considered a promising candidate according to variational calculations[34]. Meanwhile there are 20 distinct Z_2 SLs[38] in fSR (Abrikosov-fermion approach), including the so-called $Z_2[0,\pi]\beta$ state[38] which is in the neighborhood of energetically favorable $U(1)$ Dirac SL[35]. Are these two candidate states actually two different descriptions of the same gapped phase? If not, what are their counterparts in the other representation?

In this paper we establish the general connection between different Z_2 SLs in bSR and fSR. We show that Z_2 SLs constructed by projecting bilinear mean-field ansatz in bSR (Schwinger-boson representation) never have symmetry-protected gapless edge states. This important observation allows us to determine how visons transform under symmetry in Schwinger-boson Z_2 SLs, and to further relate a Schwinger-boson state to one in fSR. Since a bosonic spinon and vison fuse to a fermionic spinon, the corresponding PSGs, roughly speaking, follow a product rule. However, crucially, in some cases such as the PSG relating to inversion symmetry[23], extra phase factors enter, modifying the naive fusion rule. Here we identify two additional instances where such nontrivial PSG fusion rules occur, as explained in Section II B. (In forthcoming work, related results are established using different techniques[77,78]). This allows us to show that indeed the bosonic $Q_1 = Q_2$ state[28] is equivalent to the fermionic $Z_2[0,\pi]\beta$ state[38]. Indeed all eight SBMF states have Abrikosov fermion counterparts (see Table II). Part of these correspondences can also be inferred from Ref. 50 using wavefunction methods.

Next, we demonstrate that knowledge of just the bosonic (or just the fermionic) spinon PSG, with no further information such as the existence of a SBMF ansatz, is not enough to fully characterize a Z_2 SL. For example, two distinct Z_2 SLs in fSR can have the same PSG for fermionic spinons while only one of them has symmetry-protected gapless edge modes. However, they differ in the transformation properties of visons under symmetry (vison PSG), which provides an interesting link between symmetry implementation and topological edge states. Applying these general principles to Z_2 SLs on kagome lattice, we show that all 8 different Schwinger-boson (bSR) states have their partners in the Abrikosov-fermion (fSR) representation. In particular $Q_1 = Q_2$ state[28] in Schwinger-boson representation belongs to the same phase as $Z_2[0,\pi]\beta$ state[38] in Abrikosov-fermion representation. This correspondence allows us to identify the possible symmetry-breaking phases in proximity to Z_2 SLs on kagome lattice. Moreover these results serve as a useful guide in future studies of Z_2 SLs.

II. SYMMETRY FRACTIONALIZATION IN Z_2 SPIN LIQUIDS: GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

A. Trivial and nontrivial fusion rules of symmetry quantum numbers

Spinons and visons in a Z_2 SL satisfy the following Abelian fusion rules[7]:

$$b \times f = v, \quad b \times v = f, \quad f \times v = b,$$
$$b \times b = f \times f = v \times v = 1. \tag{1}$$

Here 1 stands for *local* excitations carrying *integer spins*, and the fractionalized excitations will not pick up any nontrivial Berry phase when they encircle a local excitation. In other words the bound state of a bosonic spinon and a fermionic spinon is a vison, and the bound state of two bosonic (fermionic) spinons or two visons is a local excitation.

The fusion rules (1) have important implications on the symmetry properties of spinons and visons. More precisely, the symmetry quantum numbers of spinons and visons must be compatible with the fusion rules[23]. Take $SU(2)$ spin rotational symmetry[79] for a simple example. Both bosonic (b) and fermionic (f) spinons carry spin-1/2 each, and vison v is a spin-singlet excitation. According to rules of angular momentum addition, one can immediately see fusion rules (1) are consistent with spin quantum numbers.

Now let us apply this principle to other symmetries, *i.e.* time reversal $\boldsymbol{T}$ and crystal symmetries of kagome lattice (see FIG. 1). Note that in a topologically ordered phase, the fractional excitations (anyons) always couple to emergent gauge fields[6,39]. A direct consequence is that symmetry transformations on these anyons are not well-defined, in the sense that they are not invariant under gauge transformations. The gauge-invariant "good" symmetry quantum numbers are the phase factors that anyons pick up through a series of symmetry operations which add up to identity operation. They correspond to different algebraic identities built up by the generators of symmetry group, as summarized in TABLE I for kagome lattice.

In a gapped Z_2 SL phase, these gauge-invariant phase factors are quantized to be ± 1. This is simply because any local excitation, as a bound state of an *even* number of spinons/visons, can only pick up a *trivial* ($+1$) phase factor after these symmetry operations. These symmetry quantum numbers are characterized by their "projective symmetry group" (PSG)[20], and two symmetric Z_2 SLs



FIG. 1: Crystal symmetries of kagome lattice with 4 generators $\{T_{1,2}, R_{\pi/3}, R_y\}$. Translations ($T_1$, T_2) along the direction 1 and 2 are drawn as the directed arrow. $R_{\pi/3}$ stands for 60 degree rotation about a hexagon center. The mirror reflection 1 is denoted by R_y, while reflection 2 corresponds to $R_{\pi/3}R_y$.



FIG. 2: (Color online) Nontrivial fusion rule of PSGs associated with inversion square operation $(R_{\pi/3})^6 = I^2$, as discussed in section II B 1. The symmetry operator associated with $(R_{\pi/3})^6 = I^2$ is illustrated by the solid (dashed) closed hexagon string with red (blue) color for fermionic spinons f (vison v). The phase factor acquired by a bosonic spinon $b = f \times v$ in this process is $e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_b} = -e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_f} \cdot e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_v}$, where the extra -1 sign comes from the crossing of fermionic spinon string (black solid line) and vison string (blue dashed line).

with different PSGs cannot be smoothly connected without breaking symmetry. TABLE I shows the spinon and vison PSGs for Z_2 SLs on kagome lattice constructed in Schwinger-boson (bSR) and Abrikosov-fermion (fSR) approach, which will be discussed in detail later in section IV.

The vison PSGs are fully determined by PSGs of bosonic/fermionic spinons due to fusion rule (1). To be specific, in many cases the phase factor $e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_b}$ picked up by a bosonic spinon equals the product of phase factor $e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_v}$ acquired by a vison and $e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_f}$ by a fermionic spinon in the same process. These cases will be referred to as the *trivial fusion rule of PSGs*. For example in the case of time reversal symmetry $\boldsymbol{T}$, it is easy to see that $\boldsymbol{T}^2 = -1$ for bosonic/fermionic spinons and $\boldsymbol{T}^2 = +1$ for visons, in accordance with their spin quantum numbers. However in a few cases $e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_b}$ can differ from $e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_v} \cdot e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_f}$ by an extra minus sign, which originates from the mutual semion statistics between a spinon and a vison. We refer to those cases as *nontrivial fusion rules of PSGs*. These cases will be discussed in detailed below.

B. Examples

In the following we discuss three nontrivial fusion rules of PSGs, which generally applies to any symmetric Z_2 spin liquid on a two-dimensional (2d) lattice. We'll first present a general physical picture for these three cases based on toric code model[7] of Z_2 topological order, and then demonstrate them in a simple projective wavefucntion. We notice that aside from nontrivial fusion rule associated with $I^2 = (R_{\pi/3})^6$, the other two nontrivial fusion rules related to reflection symmetry and time reversal symmetry are missed in Ref. 23.

1. *Square of inversion operation:* $(R_{\pi/3})^6 = I^2$

In the case of kagome lattice here, (hexagon-centered) inversion symmetry operation $I = (R_{\pi/3})^3$ is the triple action of $\pi/3$ rotation $R_{\pi/3}$ (see 8th row in TABLE I). Clearly when inversion acts twice, all particles rotate counterclockwise around a hexagon center by a full circle. Being a bound state of a bosonic and fermionic spinon, a bosonic spinon would collect an extra -1 phase factor[23] because the fermionic spinon encircles the vison once in this process.

To be more precise, let's introduce toric code model[7] as a concrete demonstration of Z_2 topological order (or Z_2 spin liquids). In the toric code model, ends of various open strings represent fractionalized excitations such as spinons and visons. There are three different types of strings, corresponding to three different anyons (bosonic spinon b, fermionic spinon f and vison v) in a Z_2 spin liquid. In the figures we use solid line to represent fermionic spinon (solid red circle) string, and dashed line for vison (blue cross) string. Anyons of different types obey mutual semion statistics, which means each crossing of two different types of strings will yield a -1 phase factor.

As illustrated in FIG. 2, we consider a fermionic spinon f on the end of a (black) solid string, and another vison

v on the end of a (black) dashed string. The bound state of these two object is a bosonic spinon $b = f \times v$. When the black string operators act on the ground state (vacuum), such an excited state is created. As $\pi/3$ rotation acts for six times or equivalently inversion symmetry operation acts twice ($(R_{\pi/3})^6 = I^2$), the phase factor acquired in this process is given by vacuum expectation value of the I^2 symmetry operator, which is the solid (dashed) closed hexagon string operator[23] with red (blue) color for fermionic spinon f (vison v). As the dashed blue string crosses with the solid black string, an extra -1 sign will appear as we commute the I^2 symmetry operator for vison and the string operator for fermionic spinon. As a result the PSGs associated with inversion square operation follows a nontrivial fusion rule. This conclusion remains true no matter the inversion symmetry is plaquette-centered or site-centered.

Now let's simply demonstrate this conclusion using a projective wavefunction in the Abrikosov-fermion representation. Consider an excited state with a pair of fermionic spinons $f_{1,2}$ related by inversion symmetry $\hat{I}$

$$|f_{1,2}\rangle \equiv f_1 f_2 |G\rangle, \quad f_2 = \hat{I} f_1 \hat{I}^{-1}. \tag{2}$$

where $|G\rangle$ represents the (mean-field) ground state. By definition of symmetry fractionalization and PSGs we know that

$$\hat{I}^2 f_{1,2} \hat{I}^{-2} = e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_f} f_{1,2}, \quad e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_f} = \pm 1. \tag{3}$$

It's straightforward to check that

$$\frac{\langle f_{1,2}|\hat{I}|f_{1,2}\rangle}{\langle G|\hat{I}|G\rangle} = -e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_f} \tag{4}$$

where the -1 sign shows up because two fermionic spinon operators f_1 and f_2 are exchanged under inversion operation $\hat{I}$. Similarly for excited state

$$|v_{1,2}\rangle \equiv v_1 v_2 |G\rangle, \quad \hat{I} v_1 \hat{I}^{-1} = v_2. \tag{5}$$

with a pair of visons $v_{1,2}$ on top of mean-field ground state, we have

$$\frac{\langle v_{1,2}|\hat{I}|v_{1,2}\rangle}{\langle G|\hat{I}|G\rangle} = e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_v}, \quad \hat{I}^2 v_{1,2} \hat{I}^{-2} = e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_v} v_{1,2} \tag{6}$$

And the excited state with a pair of bosonic spinons $b_i = f_i \times v_i$ is created by

$$|b_{1,2}\rangle = f_1 f_2 v_1 v_2 |G\rangle. \tag{7}$$

Clearly we have

$$\frac{\langle b_{1,2}|\hat{I}|b_{1,2}\rangle}{\langle G|\hat{I}|G\rangle} = e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_b} = -e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_v} \cdot e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_f} \tag{8}$$

And this proves the nontrivial fusion rule of $I^2 = (R_{\pi/3})^6$ PSGs.

2. *Square of mirror reflection operation: $(R_y)^2$ and $(R_x)^2$*

In this case let's consider a pair of fermionic spinons $f_{1,2}$ connected by a solid black string, and another pair of visons $v_{1,2}$ connected by a dashed black string as depicted in FIG. 3. We assume all these anyons lie on the reflection axis so that they are symmetric under reflection operation R. We'll reveal the nontrivial fusion rule of PSGs associated with reflection square operation R^2, by studying the reflection quantum number of these anyons. A key ingredient our discussion is that we also require the pair of fermionic spinons $f_{1,2}$ (and visons $v_{1,2}$) to be related by translation T_a, as shown in FIG. 3. This guarantees two anyons (of the same species) in a pair share the same symmetry quantum numbers.

As illustrated in FIG. 3, the total reflection (R) quantum number for the pair of fermionic spinons $f_{1,2}$ (visons $v_{1,2}$) is the vacuum expectation value of solid (dashed) closed string operator with red (blue) color. Without loss of generality, we can assume this excited state is created by first applying the solid black string on the ground state (vacuum) and then the dashed black string. Since the dashed blue string anti-commute with black solid string, the reflection quantum number of bosonic spinon pair in FIG. 3 equals the reflection quantum number of fermionic spinon pair and that of vison pair, with an extra -1 sign. Since the pair of anyons are related by translation symmetry, this -1 sign should be evenly split into two halves: *i.e.* each bosonic spinon acquires an extra $\pm\mathrm{i}$ phase (in addition to) upon reflection operation R. As a result when reflection R acts twice, the phase factor acquired by each bosonic spinon $b_i = f_i \times v_i, \quad i = 1, 2$ in this process is given by

$$e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_b} = (\pm\mathrm{i})^2 \cdot e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_f} \cdot e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_v} = -e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_f} \cdot e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_v}$$

Therefore the PSGs associated with reflection square R^2 obey the nontrivial fusion rule.

Demonstration of this conclusion for reflection square R^2 in the Abrikosov-fermion formalism follows the previous section for inversion square I^2, simply by replacing inversion I with reflection R.

3. *Commutation relation between time reversal and mirror reflection operation: $R_y^{-1}T^{-1}R_yT$ and $R_x^{-1}T^{-1}R_xT$*

Unlike other global (on-site) symmetries, time reversal is an anti-unitary symmetry operation involving a complex conjugation. Below we show a nontrivial fusion rule for PSGs associated with commutation relation between time reversal T and mirror reflection R.

Let's first consider the combination of time reversal T and mirror reflection R, which is an anti-unitary spatial symmetry. When this symmetry acts twice, does the



FIG. 3: (Color online) Nontrivial fusion rule of PSGs associated with reflection square operation R^2, as discussed in section II B 2. Reflection axis of R is denoted by the dotted green line. The symmetry operator associated with reflection R is illustrated by the solid (dashed) closed hexagon string with red (blue) color for fermionic spinons $f_{1,2}$ (vison $v_{1,2}$), in the bottom of the figure. The phase factor acquired by each bosonic spinon $b_i = f_i \times v_i,\ i = 1, 2$ in the process of R^2 is $e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_b} = -e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_f} \cdot e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_v}$, where the extra -1 sign comes from the crossing of fermionic spinon string (black solid line) and vison string (blue dashed line). Note that the pair of fermionic spinons $f_{1,2}$ (and visons $v_{1,2}$) are related by translation T_a (parallel to reflection axis), to guarantee that they share the same symmetry quantum number.

phase factor $e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_b}$ acquired by a bosonic spinon differ from $e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_v} \cdot e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_f}$ by an extra -1 sign or not? The answer is no. In the same setup as in FIG. 3, each bosonic spinon gets an extra $\pm\mathrm{i}$ phase (in addition to the phase factors acquired by fermionic spinon and vison) under reflection R. However when time reversal acts, it takes complex conjugation and hence we have $(\pm\mathrm{i})^*(\pm\mathrm{i}) = 1$. This extra phase cancels out upon symmetry operation $(TR)^2$. Therefore PSGs associated with $(TR)^2$ obey the trivial fusion rule. As an algebraic identity we have

$$(TR)^2 = (R^{-1}T^{-1}RT) \cdot (T^2) \cdot (R^2). \tag{9}$$



FIG. 4: (Color online) Nontrivial fusion rule of PSGs associated with $R^{-1}T^{-1}RT$, as discussed in section II B 3. Reflection axis of R is denoted by the dotted green line. We consider a YC4 cylinder where the two sites labeled by f_2 are actually the same one. The phase factor acquired by each bosonic spinon $b_i = f_i \times v_i,\ i = 1, 2$ in this process is $e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_b} = -e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_f} \cdot e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_v}$. Note that the pair of fermionic spinons $f_{1,2}$ (and visons $v_{1,2}$) are related by translation T_1 (parallel to reflection axis), to guarantee that they share the same symmetry quantum number.

We know that PSGs of T^2 and $(TR)^2$ obey trivial fusion rule, while PSGs of R^2 obey nontrivial fusion rule (previous section). Therefore the PSGs associated with $R^{-1}T^{-1}RT$ must also obey nontrivial fusion rule.

To demonstrate it in the Abrikosov-fermion formulation, let's consider a superconducting ground state of Abrokosov fermions on a simplest YC4 cylinder (in notation of Ref. 9). As shown on FIG. 4, the two sites (on left and right hand sides) labeled by f_2 are the same one. Again we have a pair of visons $v_{1,2}$ and a pair of fermionic spinons $f_{1,2}$, each related by translation T_1. For simplicity but without loss of generality, we consider a mean-field ansatz with on-site chemical potential terms and various-range real pairings of Abrikosov fermions. The visons are created by the following action on the mean-field ansatz: all pairing amplitudes (pointing upwards) that cross the dashed red line acquire a i sign while every pairing amplitude (pointing upwards) that crosses the dashed blue line acquires a $-\mathrm{i}$ sign. Therefore in the presence of this vison pair, the reflection symmetry operation on Abrikosov fermions is

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{R}' &= e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{\pi}{2}\sum_{a=1,2}(-1)^a n_a}\hat{R}, \\ \hat{R}' f_a (\hat{R}')^{-1} &= (-1)^a \mathrm{i}\hat{R} f_a \hat{R}^{-1}, \quad a = 1, 2. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where $\hat{R}$ is the original reflection symmetry operation on Abrikosov fermions, in the absence of visons. We used n_a to denote the fermion number on site $a = 1, 2$. From the above relation, it's straightforward to check the nontrivial fusion rule of PSGs for R^2 and $R^{-1}T^{-1}RT$.

Algebraic Identities	bosonic b_σ	fermionic f_σ	vison $v = b \times f$
$T_2^{-1}T_1^{-1}T_2T_1$	$(-1)^{p_1}$	η_{12}	-1
$T_1^{-1}R_{\pi/3}^{-1}T_2R_{\pi/3}$	1	1	1
$T_1^{-1}T_2R_{\pi/3}^{-1}T_1R_{\pi/3}$	1	1	1
$T_1^{-1}R_y^{-1}T_1R_y$	$(-1)^{p_1}$	η_{12}	-1
$T_1^{-1}T_2R_y^{-1}T_2R_y$	$(-1)^{p_1}$	η_{12}	-1
$R_x^2 \equiv (R_{\pi/3}R_y)^2$	$(-1)^{p_2+p_3}$	$\eta_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$	1
$(R_y)^2$	$(-1)^{p_2}$	$\eta_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\eta_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}C_6}$	1
$(R_{\pi/3})^6 = I^2$	$(-1)^{p_1+p_3}$	η_{C_6}	1
$T_1^{-1}T^{-1}T_1T$	1	1	1
$T_2^{-1}T^{-1}T_2T$	1	1	1
$R_y^{-1}T^{-1}R_yT$	$(-1)^{p_2}$	$\eta_{\boldsymbol{\sigma T}}\eta_{C_6\boldsymbol{T}}$	1
$R_x^{-1}T^{-1}R_xT$	$(-1)^{p_2+p_3}$	$\eta_{\boldsymbol{\sigma T}}$	1
T^2	-1	-1	1

TABLE I: The algebraic identities and correspondence between bosonic spinon[29], fermionic spinon[38] and vison[41] PSGs on kagome lattice. Mirror reflection R_x is defined as $R_x \equiv (R_{\pi/3})^2 R_y (R_{\pi/3})^{-1}$. Here bosonic spinon ($b_\sigma$) PSGs are labeled by three integers[29] $p_i = 0, 1$ $(i = 1, 2, 3)$, while fermionic spinon (f_σ) PSGs are labeled by seven integers[38] $(\eta_{12}, \eta_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}, \eta_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}C_6}, \eta_{C_6}, \eta_{\boldsymbol{\sigma T}}, \eta_{C_6\boldsymbol{T}})$ where $\eta = \pm 1$. Choosing a proper gauge we can always fix $T_1^{-1}R_{\pi/3}^{-1}T_2R_{\pi/3} = T_1^{-1}T_2R_{\pi/3}^{-1}T_1R_{\pi/3} = 1$ for both spinons and visons. If a Z_2 SL in bSR and one in fSR correspond to the same state, their PSGs must satisfy conditions (19). Meanwhile the vison PSG for *any* Z_2 SL in bSR is completely fixed as shown above.

Notice that inversion symmetry I is a combination of two reflection symmetry *i.e.* $I = R_xR_y$. Therefore the PSGs associated with $I^{-1}T^{-1}IT$ simply follow the trivial fusion rule.

Before closing of this section, we want to mention that all arguments used here can be made more rigorous by considering a thin cylinder geometry which relates the PSGs to one-dimensional invariants of symmetry protected topological (SPT) phases[40]. These results will be published elsewhere[78].

III. SYMMETRY PROTECTED EDGE STATES AND VISON QUANTUM NUMBERS

Previously we discussed why the "good" symmetry quantum numbers for spinons/visons are their PSGs, and how the vison PSGs can be determined once we know PSGs of both bosonic and fermionic spinons. But one important question still remains to be answered: what are the physical manifestations of the vison PSG?

An important measurable property of topological phases are their edge states. Although Z_2 SLs in the absence of symmetries are expected to have gapped edges, the edge may be gapless in the presence of symmetries[25,42,43], or, in the case of discrete symmetries, spontaneously break symmetry at the edge. In particular, the criterion for nontrivial edges of Z_2 SLs with $SU(2)$ spin rotation symmetry will be established below and shown to be particularly simple. The edge modes of a Z_2 SL can always be fermionized[44] with the same number of right ($\psi_{R,a}$) and left ($\psi_{L,a}$) movers (velocity is set to unity):

$$\mathcal{L}_0 = \textstyle\sum_a \mathrm{i}\psi^\dagger_{R,a}(\partial_t - \partial_x)\psi_{R,a} - \mathrm{i}\psi^\dagger_{L,a}(\partial_t + \partial_x)\psi_{L,a} \quad (11)$$

where a denotes different branches of left/right movers. One can always add backscattering terms to gap out the edge modes $\{\psi_{R/L,a}\}$

$$\mathcal{L}_1 = \sum_{a,b} \psi^\dagger_{R,a}\mathbf{M}_{a,b}\psi_{L,b} + \psi_{R,a}\mathbf{\Delta}_{a,b}\psi_{L,b} + \ h.c. \quad (12)$$

if they are not forbidden by symmetry. In a different language, the above "mass" terms correspond to condensing either bosonic spinons b or visons v on the edge[45] of a Z_2 SL. Since the spinons carry spin-1/2 each, condensing them will necessarily break spin rotational symmetry on the edge. Therefore the only way to obtain a gapped edge without breaking the symmetry is to condense visons, unless their crystal symmetry quantum numbers (PSGs) will not allow it. The relevant symmetries here are the ones that leave the physical edge unchanged, *e.g.* at least one translation symmetry among $T_{1,2}$ will be broken by the edge. Therefore the existence or absence of symmetry protected edge states is a probe of the vison PSGs.

Take kagome lattice for instance, on a cylinder with open boundaries parallel to T_1 direction (X-edge in FIG. 1), the remaining symmetries are translation T_1, time reversal T and mirror reflection $R_x \equiv (R_{\pi/3})^2 R_y (R_{\pi/3})^{-1}$. If there are no symmetry protected edge states, then the remaining symmetries must act trivially on visons:

$$\begin{aligned} T_1^{-1}T^{-1}T_1T = R_x^{-1}T^{-1}R_xT = 1, \\ R_x^2 = T_1R_x^{-1}T_1R_x = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

so no backscattering term is forbidden by symmetry.

Another inequivalent edge is perpendicular to T_1 direction (Y-edge in FIG. 1), which preserves translation $T_1^{-1}T_2^2$, time reversal T and mirror reflection R_y. Similarly, absence of protected edge modes necessarily implies

$$\begin{aligned} T_2^{-2}T_1T^{-1}T_1^{-1}T_2^2T = R_y^{-1}T^{-1}R_yT = 1, \\ R_y^2 = T_1^{-1}T_2^2R_y^{-1}T_1^{-1}T_2^2R_y = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

i.e. these symmetries also have trivial actions on visons.

In addition to edge states, symmetry-protected in-gap bound state in crystal defects[46,47] (such as dislocations and disclinations) is another signature to probe crystal symmetry quantum numbers. Just like gapless edge modes, the existence of defect bound states must require non-trivial vison PSGs of the associated crystal symmetry. In our case of kagome lattice, the crystal defect associated with $R_{\pi/3}$ rotation is a disclination, centered on

Abrikosov-fermion representation[38] (fSR)									Schwinger-boson representation[29] (bSR)	
#	η_{12}	$\eta_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$	$\eta_{\boldsymbol{\sigma T}}$	$\eta_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}C_6}$	$\eta_{C_6\boldsymbol{T}}$	η_{C_6}	Label	Perturbatively gapped?	(p_1,p_2,p_3)	Label
1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	$Z_2[0,0]A$	Yes	(1,1,0)	
2	-1	+1	+1	+1	+1	-1	$Z_2[0,\pi]\beta$	Yes	(0,1,0)	$Q_1=Q_2$ state
5	+1	+1	+1	-1	-1	-1	$Z_2[0,0]B$	Yes	(1,0,1)	
6	-1	+1	+1	-1	-1	+1	$Z_2[0,\pi]\alpha$	No	(0,0,1)	$Q_1=-Q_2$ state
13	+1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	$Z_2[0,0]D$	Yes	(1,1,1)	
14	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	+1	$Z_2[0,\pi]\gamma$	No	(0,1,1)	
15	+1	-1	-1	+1	+1	+1	$Z_2[0,0]C$	Yes	(1,0,0)	
16	-1	-1	-1	+1	+1	-1	$Z_2[0,\pi]\delta$	No	(0,0,0)	

TABLE II: Correspondence between Schwinger-boson Z_2 SLs[29] and Abrikosov-fermion states[38] on kagome lattice. All 8 unequal Schwinger-boson (bSR) states have their counterparts among 20 different Abrikosov-fermion (fSR) states. $Q_1=Q_2$ state[28] in Schwinger-boson representation is equivalent to $Z_2[0,\pi]\beta$ state[38], the only gapped Z_2 SL near energetically favorable $U(1)$ Dirac state[35]. On the other hand $Q_1=-Q_2$ state[28] or $(0,0,1)$ state in Schwinger-boson representation corresponds to $Z_2[0,\pi]\alpha$ state in Abrikosov-fermion representation.

the hexagon with Frank angle $\Omega=n\pi/3,\ n\in\mathbb{Z}$. Now let us imagine a vison circles around an elementary disclination with $\Omega=\pi/3$ for six times counterclockwise, and the phase factor it picks up in this process equals to the vison PSG $(R_{\pi/3})^6$. Note that a vison only acquires a trivial (+1) phase factor when it encircles any number of spinons six times. Therefore if $(R_{\pi/3})^6=-1$ for visons, there must be a nontrivial in-gap bound state localized at the $\Omega=\pi/3$ disclination. And the absence of in-gap bound state inside the disclination dictates

$$(R_{\pi/3})^6=R_{\pi/3}^{-1}T^{-1}R_{\pi/3}T=1. \tag{15}$$

Notice that this argument only applies to a plaquette-centered rotation (such as $R_{\pi/3}$ here), because visons live on plaquettes. For a site-centered crystal rotation, similar conclusions are not valid anymore.

To summarize, if a Z_2 SL does not host any gapless edge states or in-gap defect bound state protected by symmetry, vison PSGs must satisfy conditions (13)-(15).

Furthermore, for a Mott insulator (with an odd number of spin 1/2 moments per unit cell) like the kagome S=1/2 model, a confined phase with a spin gap must double the unit cell. Therefore the visions PSG under translations must satisfy:

$$T_1T_2=-T_2T_1 \tag{16}$$

This may be thought of as visons acquiring an extra phase factor on going around a unit cell with an odd number of spinons. All together this leads to the vison PSGs shown in TABLE I, assuming the absence of gapless edge states or in-gap disclination bound states which are protected by symmetries. The detailed derivations are summarized in Appendix A.

IV. UNIFICATION OF SLAVE-PARTICLE MEAN-FIELD THEORIES ON THE KAGOME LATTICE

In bSR or Schwinger-boson approach[48], a spin-1/2 on lattice site $\mathbf{r}$ is decomposed into two species of bosonic spinons $\{b_{\mathbf{r},\alpha}|\alpha=\uparrow/\downarrow\}$:

$$\vec{S}_{\mathbf{r}}=\frac{1}{2}\sum_{\alpha,\beta=\uparrow/\downarrow}b^\dagger_{\mathbf{r},\alpha}\vec{\sigma}_{\alpha,\beta}b_{\mathbf{r},\beta} \tag{17}$$

where $\vec{\sigma}$ are Pauli matrices. Meanwhile in fSR or Abrikosov-fermion approach[30] spin-1/2 is represented by two flavors of fermionic spinons[33] $\{f_{\mathbf{r},\alpha}|\alpha=\uparrow/\downarrow\}$

$$\vec{S}_{\mathbf{r}}=\frac{1}{2}\sum_{\alpha,\beta=\uparrow/\downarrow}f^\dagger_{\mathbf{r},\alpha}\vec{\sigma}_{\alpha,\beta}f_{\mathbf{r},\beta} \tag{18}$$

To faithfully reproduce the 2-dimensional Hilbert space for spin-1/2, there is a *single-occupancy constraint*: $\sum_\alpha b^\dagger_{\mathbf{r},\alpha}b_{\mathbf{r},\alpha}=\sum_\alpha f^\dagger_{\mathbf{r},\alpha}f_{\mathbf{r},\alpha}=1$ on every lattice site $\forall\ \mathbf{r}$. The variational wavefunctions are obtained by implementing Gutzwiller projections[49] on spinon mean-field ground state $|MF\rangle$, in order to enforce the single-occupancy constraint. Here $|MF\rangle$ is the ground state of *(quadratic) mean-field ansatz* for bosonic spinons[28,29]:

$$\hat{H}^b_{MF}=\sum_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}\sum_{\alpha,\beta}A_{\mathbf{x},y}b^\dagger_{\mathbf{x},\alpha}b_{\mathbf{y},\alpha}+B_{\mathbf{x},y}b_{\mathbf{x},\alpha}\epsilon^{\alpha\beta}b_{\mathbf{y},\beta}+\ h.c.$$

and similarly

$$\hat{H}^f_{MF}=\sum_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}\begin{pmatrix}f^\dagger_{\mathbf{x},\uparrow}\\ f_{\mathbf{x},\downarrow}\end{pmatrix}^T\begin{pmatrix}t_{\mathbf{x},y} & \Delta_{\mathbf{x},y}\\ \Delta^*_{\mathbf{x},y} & -t^*_{\mathbf{x},y}\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}f_{\mathbf{y},\uparrow}\\ f^\dagger_{\mathbf{y},\downarrow}\end{pmatrix}+\ h.c.$$

for fermionic spinons[3,20]. Proper on-site chemical potentials guarantee single-occupancy in $|MF\rangle$ on average.

The physical properties of a gapped Z_2 SL described by a projected wavefunction can be understood in terms of its mean-field ansatz. Specifically in bSR and fSR of Z_2 SLs, different PSGs for bosonic and fermionic spinons lead to distinct hopping/pairing patterns in mean-field ansatz H^b_{MF} anf H^f_{Mf}. As pointed out in Ref. 29 there are 8 different Schwinger-boson (bSR) mean-field ansatz of Z_2 SLs on kagome lattice, while 20 distinct mean-field ansatz exists in fSR as shown in Ref. 38. A natural question is: what is the relation between the Z_2 SLs in bSR and those in fSR? Can they describe the same Z_2 SL phase or not?

To answer this question, we use their vison symmetry quantum numbers (PSGs) to determine the (in)equivalence of the two representations. To be precise, a Schwinger-boson ansatz corresponds to the same phase as an Abrikosov-fermion ansatz *if and only if* they share the same vison PSG. As mentioned earlier, vison PSGs of a Z_2 SL can be probed by checking whether symmetry-protected edge states or in-gap defect (*e.g.* disclination) bound states exist or not. One important observation is that *none of Z_2 SLs constructed in Schwinger-boson approach supports any gapless edge state or in-gap defect bound state*. This can be verified by computing the edge spectrum or defect spectrum in a Schwinger-boson mean-field ansatz. Any gapped Schwinger-boson Z_2 SL ansatz can be tuned continuously to a limit that on-site chemical potential dominates over pairing/hopping terms, where it is clear no in-gap modes exist in edge/defect spectra. Therefore the vison PSGs in any Schwinger-boson ansatz is fully fixed as in TABLE I. Amazingly this result (last column in TABLE I) agrees with vison PSGs derived microscopically from Schwinger-boson ansatz[41].

As discussed previously fermionic/bosnic spinon and vison PSGs are restricted by fusion rules (1). More concretely vison PSGs always equal the product of bosonic and fermionic spinon PSGs *i.e.* $e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_v} = e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_b}\cdot e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_f}$, except for the three situations discussed in section II B where $e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_v} = -e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_b}\cdot e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_f}$. These nontrivial fusion rules of PSGs take place in row 6-8 and 11-12 in TABLE I, for algebraic relations I^2, $R^2_{x,y}$ and $R^{-1}_{x,y}T^{-1}R_{x,y}T$. Therefore from TABLE I, we can decide the relation between a Schwinger-boson ansatz and an Abrikosov-fermion ansatz, if they describes the same gapped Z_2 SL. This leads to the following conditions:

$$\eta_{12} = (-1)^{p_1+1},\ \eta_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} = \eta_{\boldsymbol{\sigma T}} = (-1)^{p_2+p_3+1},$$
$$\eta_{\boldsymbol{\sigma} C_6} = \eta_{C_6\boldsymbol{T}} = (-1)^{p_3},\ \eta_{C_6} = (-1)^{p_1+p_3+1}. \quad (19)$$

It turns out all 8 distinct gaped Z_2 SLs described by bSR(Schwinger-boson approach) can also represented by fSR (Abrikosov-fermion approach) as summarized in TABLE II. Moreover, the most promising Schwinger-boson state for kagome Heisenberg model, $Q_1 = Q_2$ state[28], describes the same spin liquid phase as the most promising $Z_2[0,\pi]\beta$ state[38] in Abrikosov-fermion approach. We notice that 4 of these 8 correspondences (the top 4 rows in TABLE II) have been obtained in Ref. 50.

V. CANDIDATE SETS FOR KAGOME HEISENBERG ANTIFERROMAGNET

We have noted that there are 20 different Abrikosov-fermion (fSR) mean-field states and 8 different Schwinger-boson (bSR) mean-field states of Z_2 spin liquids on the kagome lattice. Here we will argue that one state is the most promising candidate from the following two criteria (i) energetics, as elaborated below and (ii) the requirement that the phase to be connected to a $q = 0$ magnetically ordered state via a continuous transition. This candidate is $Q_1 = Q_2$ Schwinger-boson state, or equivalently $Z_2[0,\pi]\beta$ Abrikosov-fermion state.

Numerical studies on the kagome lattice Heisenberg antiferromagnet supplemented by a 2nd neighbor antiferromagnetic coupling (J_2) reveal that[51] on increasing J_2, the quantum spin liquid phase is initially further stabilized, before undergoing a transition[51] into a $q = 0$ magnetic order around $J_2 \simeq 0.2J_1$. Since the correlation length increases as the transition is approached, it is likely to be second order. The $q = 0$ magnetic order is a coplanar magnetic ordered state in which the three sublattices have spins aligned along three directions at 120 degrees to one another. The Schwinger-boson state that naturally accounts for this is the $Q_1 = Q_2$ state in Ref. 28, where under condensation of bosonic spinons the $q = 0$ magnetic order develops via a continuous transition in the O(4) universality class[52]. Furthermore, variational permanent wavefunctions[34] based on the $Q_1 = Q_2$ state were shown to give very competitive energies in particular for small and positive J_2, establishing it as a contending state.

The $Z_2[0,\pi]\beta$ mean-field state[38] of Abrikosov fermions (fSR), also satisfies the desirable properties above. It can be thought as the s-wave paired superconductor of fermionic spinons near the energetically favorable $U(1)$ Dirac SL[35]. The s-wave pairing opens up a gap at the Dirac point of the underlying $U(1)$ Dirac SL and this implies that the $Z_2[0,\pi]\beta$ state could be energetically competing with the $U(1)$ Dirac SL[38]. Although variational wave functions that include pairing are often found to have higher energy[36] than the underlying $U(1)$ Dirac SL, we note that this is a restricted class of states accessible via the parton construction, and a more complete search may land in the superconducting phase. For our purposes we will be content that it is proximate to the energetically favorable $U(1)$ spin liquid state. One can also describe a continuous transition from this Z_2 SL to the coplanar $q = 0$ magnetically ordered state, although the argument here is more involved than in the case of the Schwinger-boson representation. We make this argument[37] in two parts - first by ignoring the effects of the gauge field and recalling[53] a seemingly unrelated transition between an s-wave superconductor and a quantum spin Hall phase of the fermionic partons. The latter spontaneously breaks the $SU(2)$ spin rotation symmetry down to $U(1)$ that defines the direction of the conserved spin component. On including gauge fluctuations we will argue that the quan-

tum spin Hall phase is to be identified with the $q = 0$ magnetic order.

Starting with the $U(1)$ Dirac spin liquid, the s-wave superconductor representing the Z_2 SL is obtained by including a superconducting 'mass' term that gaps the Dirac dispersion. Similarly, the quantum spin Hall phase is obtained by introducing a distinct 'mass' term that also gaps out the Dirac nodes. There are three such mass terms indexed by the direction of the conserved spin in the quantum spin Hall state. All of these anti-commute with the superconducting mass term, which implies that a continuous transition is possible between these phases[53]. On integrating out the fermions, the coefficients of the mass terms form an $O(5)$ vector of order parameters (real and imaginary parts of the pairing and the three quantum spin Hall mass terms), described by $O(5)$ non-linear sigma model with a Wess-Zumino-Witten (WZW) term[37,53–56]. Then the presence of the WZW term implies a continuous phase transition from the superconductor to the quantum spin hall state with a spontaneously chosen orientation. This is most readily seen by noting that skyrmions of the quantum spin Hall director carry charge 2, which when condensed lead to a superconductor with spin rotation symmetry[53]. Now, on including gauge couplings the superconductor is converted into the $Z_2[0,\pi]\beta$ SL state. The quantum spin Hall state is a gapped insulator coupled to a compact U(1) gauge field, which is expected to confine and lead to a conventional ordered state. This is seen to be the non-collinear magnetically ordered phase with the vector chirality at $q = 0$ (for details see Appendix D). The photon is identified as the additional Goldstone mode that appears since the $q = 0$ state completely breaks spin rotation symmetry. This further confirms the identification between $Q_1 = Q_2$ Schwinger-boson state and $Z_2[0,\pi]\beta$ Abrikosov-fermion state, since they are in the neighborhood of the same magnetic order.

VI. FERMIONIC Z_2 SPIN LIQUIDS WITH SYMMETRY PROTECTED EDGE STATES

In the Schwinger-boson representation, due to the absence of protected gapless edge states (or in-gap disclination bound states), the vison PSG is completely fixed. Therefore the PSG of bosonic spinons (b) fully determines a symmetric Z_2 SL phase in Schwinger-boson approach. In other words, two Schwinger-boson mean-field ansatz correspond to the same Z_2 SL phase *if and only if* they share the same bosonic-spinon PSG.

However this is not true in the Abrikosov-fermion representation: *i.e.* two distinct Z_2 SL phases can share the same fermionic-spinon PSG in their Abrikosov-fermion mean-field ansatz. This is essentially because the band topology[57–59] in an Abrikosov-fermion mean-field ansatz, which determines the vison PSG of a Z_2 SL, is not captured by the fermionic-spinon PSG. In particular, certain fermionic-spinon PSGs allow for a nontrivial band topology: this is manifested by the symmetry protected edge states in a reflection-symmetric topological superconductor of Abrikosov-fermions.

A. Reflection protected X-edge states

There are two types of open edges in a cylinder geometry, *i.e.* X-edge and Y-edge in FIG. 1. Other translational-symmetric open edges can be obtained by multiples of $R_{\pi/3}$ rotation acting on these two prototype edges. As mentioned earlier, a cylinder with open X-edge preserves a symmetry group generated by $\{T, T_1, R_x \equiv (R_{\pi/3})^2 R_y (R_{\pi/3})^{-1}\}$ and $SU(2)$ spin rotations. It's straightforward to see that

$$T_1^{-1} T^{-1} T_1 T = T_1 R_x^{-1} T_1 R_x = 1. \tag{20}$$

for all Abrikosov-fermion states. Since translational symmetry T_1 also commutes with spin rotations, it can be disentangled from other symmetries. As discussed in Appendix C, one can futher show that translational symmetry T_1 won't give rise to any nontrivial topological index. Focusing on time reversal T, mirror reflection R_x (and $SU(2)$ spin rotations which commute with both T and R_x), we have

$$(R_x)^2 = \eta_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}, \quad R_x^{-1} T^{-1} R_x T = \eta_{\boldsymbol{\sigma T}}. \tag{21}$$

for Abrikosov fermions f. As proven in Appendix C, only when

$$\eta_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} = -1, \quad \eta_{\boldsymbol{\sigma T}} = +1. \tag{22}$$

will there be a nontrivial integer index $\mathbb{Z}$ for topological superconductors. As summarized in TABLE III, there are 6 fermionic-spinon PSGs (#7 $\sim$ #12) that can support such a topological superconductor.

B. Reflection protected Y-edge states

On a cylinder with open Y-edge the symmetry group is generated by $\{T, T_y \equiv T_1^{-1} T_2^2, R_y\}$ and $SU(2)$ spin rotations. Again one can easily show that

$$T_y^{-1} T^{-1} T_y T = T_y R_y^{-1} T_y R_y = 1. \tag{23}$$

for all Abrikosov-fermion states and we can disentangle translation T_y from other symmetries. With reflection R_y and time reversal T on Y-edge we have

$$R_y^2 = \eta_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} \eta_{\boldsymbol{\sigma} C_6}, \quad R_y^{-1} T^{-1} R_y T = \eta_{\boldsymbol{\sigma T}} \eta_{C_6 \boldsymbol{T}}. \tag{24}$$

Similarly a nontrivial integer index $\mathbb{Z}$ can only happen when

$$\eta_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} \eta_{\boldsymbol{\sigma} C_6} = -1, \quad \eta_{\boldsymbol{\sigma T}} \eta_{C_6 \boldsymbol{T}} = +1. \tag{25}$$

#	η_{12}	$\eta_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$	$\eta_{\boldsymbol{\sigma T}}$	$\eta_{\boldsymbol{\sigma} C_6}$	$\eta_{C_6 \boldsymbol{T}}$	η_{C_6}	Label	Perturbatively gapped?	X-edge	Y-edge	(p_1, p_2, p_3)	Label
1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	$Z_2[0,0]A$	Yes	0	0	(1,1,0)	
2	-1	+1	+1	+1	+1	-1	$Z_2[0,\pi]\beta$	Yes	0	0	(0,1,0)	$Q_1 = Q_2$ state
3	+1	+1	+1	-1	+1	-1	$Z_2[\pi,\pi]A$	No	0	$\mathbb{Z}$		
4	-1	+1	+1	-1	+1	+1	$Z_2[\pi,0]A$	No	0	$\mathbb{Z}$		
5	+1	+1	+1	-1	-1	-1	$Z_2[0,0]B$	Yes	0	0	(1,0,1)	
6	-1	+1	+1	-1	-1	+1	$Z_2[0,\pi]\alpha$	No	0	0	(0,0,1)	$Q_1 = -Q_2$ state
7	+1	-1	+1	-1	+1	-1	-	-	$\mathbb{Z}$	0		
8	-1	-1	+1	-1	+1	+1	-	-	$\mathbb{Z}$	0		
9	+1	-1	+1	+1	+1	+1	-	-	$\mathbb{Z}$	$\mathbb{Z}$		
10	-1	-1	+1	+1	+1	-1	-	-	$\mathbb{Z}$	$\mathbb{Z}$		
11	+1	-1	+1	+1	-1	-1	-	-	$\mathbb{Z}$	0		
12	-1	-1	+1	+1	-1	+1	-	-	$\mathbb{Z}$	0		
13	+1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	$Z_2[0,0]D$	Yes	0	0	(1,1,1)	
14	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	+1	$Z_2[0,\pi]\gamma$	No	0	0	(0,1,1)	
15	+1	-1	-1	+1	+1	+1	$Z_2[0,0]C$	Yes	0	0	(1,0,0)	
16	-1	-1	-1	+1	+1	-1	$Z_2[0,\pi]\delta$	No	0	0	(0,0,0)	
17	+1	-1	-1	+1	+1	-1	$Z_2[\pi,\pi]B$	No	0	0		
18	-1	-1	-1	+1	+1	+1	$Z_2[\pi,0]B$	No	0	0		
19	+1	-1	-1	+1	-1	-1	$Z_2[\pi,\pi]C$	No	0	$\mathbb{Z}$		
20	-1	-1	-1	+1	-1	+1	$Z_2[\pi,0]C$	No	0	$\mathbb{Z}$		

TABLE III: 20 different Abrikosov-fermion Z_2 SLs on a kagome lattice in the notation of Ref. 38. Among them state #2 or $Z_2[0,\pi]\beta$ state corresponds to the same phase as $Q_1 = Q_2$ state[28] in Schwinger-boson representation with[29] $(p_1, p_2, p_3) = (0, 1, 0)$. Meanwhile #6 or $Z_2[0,\pi]\alpha$ state belongs to the same phase as the so-called $Q_1 = -Q_2$ state in Schwinger-boson representation with $(p_1, p_2, p_3) = (0, 0, 1)$. "Perturbatively gapped" means that fermion spinons can reach a fully-gapped superconducting ground state by perturbing the nearest neighbor (NN) hopping ansatz. "0" is a trivial topological index, indicating the absence of symmetry protected gapless modes on the edge. Meanwhile $\mathbb{Z}$ is a nontrivial integer topological index for possible symmetry protected gapless edge states. Among the 20 Abrikosov-fermion states, 6 can host protected edge states on X-edge, while 6 can support protected edge modes on Y-edge. None of the 8 Abrikosov-fermion states that have counterparts in Schwinger-boson representation support gapless edge states.

It turns out that only 6 fermionic-spinon PSGs (#3, #4, #9, #10, #19, #20) in TABLE III can support topological superconductors with protected gapless modes on Y-edge.

C. An example and effective field theory

As one example, in the root state ($\nu = 1$) which generates the integer ($\nu \in \mathbb{Z}$) topological index, the low-energy edge excitations are described by 2 pairs of counter-propagating fermion modes (see Appendix C for derivations)

$$\mathcal{L}^0_{edge} = \sum_{a=\uparrow,\downarrow} \mathrm{i}\psi^\dagger_{R,a}(\partial_t - \partial_x)\psi_{R,a} - \mathrm{i}\psi^\dagger_{L,a}(\partial_t + \partial_x)\psi_{L,a} \tag{26}$$

where the velocity is normalized as unity. The fermion modes transform under symmetries (time reversal T, reflection R and spin rotations) in the following way:

$$\psi_{\alpha,a} \xrightarrow{T} \textstyle\sum_{\beta,b}[\tau_x]_{\alpha,\beta}[\mathrm{i}\sigma_y]_{a,b}\psi_{\beta,b} \tag{27}$$

$$\psi_{\alpha,a} \xrightarrow{R} \textstyle\sum_{\beta,b}[\tau_x]_{\alpha,\beta}[\mathrm{i}\sigma_y]_{a,b}\psi^\dagger_{\beta,b} \tag{28}$$

$$\psi_{\alpha,a} \xrightarrow{\exp(\mathrm{i}\theta\hat{n}\cdot\vec{S})} \textstyle\sum_b \left[e^{\mathrm{i}\frac{\theta}{2}\hat{n}\cdot\vec{\sigma}}\right]_{a,b}\psi_{\alpha,b} \tag{29}$$

where we use index $\alpha = R/L$ and $\vec{\tau}$ matrices for chirality (right/left movers), index $a = \uparrow / \downarrow$ and $\vec{\sigma}$ matrices for spin. It's straightforward to see that $TR = RT$ and $R^2 = -1$. There are two kinds of backscattering terms between right and left movers, which preserve $SU(2)$ spin rotational symmetry:

$$\mathcal{H}_{hop} = \textstyle\sum_a \left(t\ \psi^\dagger_{R,a}\psi_{L,a} + t^*\ \psi^\dagger_{L,a}\psi_{R,a}\right),$$
$$\mathcal{H}_{pair} = \textstyle\sum_{a,b} \left(\Delta\psi_{R,a}[\mathrm{i}\sigma_y]_{a,b}\psi_{L,b} + \Delta^*\psi^\dagger_{L,b}[\mathrm{i}\sigma_y]_{a,b}\psi^\dagger_{R,a}\right).$$

Among them, imaginary pairing is forbidden by time reversal T, while hopping and real pairing are both forbidden by mirror reflection R.

Such a gapped Z_2 SL with symmetry protected edge states is described by a multi-component Chern-Simons theory

$$\mathcal{L}_{bulk} = \frac{\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho}}{4\pi} \sum_{I,J=1}^{4} a^I_\mu \mathbf{K}_{I,J} \partial_\nu a^J_\rho - \sum_{I=1}^{4} a^I_\mu j^\mu_I \tag{30}$$

with a 4×4 $\mathbf{K}$ matrix[25]

$$\mathbf{K} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = 2\mathbf{K}^{-1} \tag{31}$$

The associated edge excitations are encoded by chiral boson fields $\{\phi_I | 1 \le I \le 4\}$ with effective theory:

$$\mathcal{L}_{edge} = \frac{1}{4\pi} \sum_{I,J=1}^{4} \Big(\partial_t \phi_I \mathbf{K}_{I,J} \partial_x \phi_J - \partial_x \phi_I \mathbf{V}_{I,J} \partial_x \phi_J \Big) \tag{32}$$

where $\mathbf{V}$ is a positive-definite real symmetric matrix depending on details of the open edge. In particular there are two species of visons (v) created by vertex operators $e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_1}$ and $e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_2}$ separately, while bosonic spinons (b) are created by $e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_3}$ and $e^{\mathrm{i}\phi_4}$ operators. Under a symmetry operation g the chiral bosons transform as[25,60,61]

$$\phi_I \xrightarrow{g} \tilde{\phi}_I = \sum_J s_g \big[\mathbf{W}^g\big]_{I,J} \phi_J + \delta\phi^g_I.$$

where the sign $s_g = +1$ for a unitary symmetry (such as mirror reflection R and spin rotations) and $s_g = -1$ for an anti-unitary symmetry (such as time reversal T). In our case of a Z_2 SL with symmetry protected edge states, for spin rotation $S^z_\theta \equiv \prod_i \exp(\mathrm{i}\frac{\theta}{2}\sigma^z_i)$ by angle θ along $\hat{z}$-axis

$$\mathbf{W}^{S^z_\theta} = 1_{4\times 4}, \quad \delta\phi^{S^z_\theta} = \frac{\theta}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{33}$$

For Ising symmetry $S^x \equiv \prod_i \sigma^x_i$ (spin rotation by angle π along $\hat{x}$-axis) we have

$$\mathbf{W}^{S^x} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \delta\phi^{S^x} = \frac{\pi}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{34}$$

For anti-unitary time reversal symmetry T

$$\mathbf{W}^{T} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \delta\phi^{T} = \frac{\pi}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{35}$$

For mirror reflection symmetry R we have

$$\mathbf{W}^{R} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \delta\phi^{R} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \pi \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{36}$$

Notice that under either time reversal T or mirror reflection R, the $\mathbf{K}$ matrix changes sign *i.e.*

$$\Big(\mathbf{W}^g\Big)^T \mathbf{K} \mathbf{W}^g = -\mathbf{K}, \quad g = T, R \tag{37}$$

The two pairs of fermionic modes are given in terms of chiral bosons as

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{R,\uparrow} &\sim e^{\mathrm{i}(\phi_1+\phi_4)}, \quad \psi_{R,\downarrow} \sim e^{\mathrm{i}(\phi_2-\phi_4)}, \\ \psi_{L,\uparrow} &\sim e^{\mathrm{i}(\phi_4-\phi_1)}, \quad \psi_{L,\downarrow} \sim e^{-\mathrm{i}(\phi_2+\phi_4)}. \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

up to Klein factors. The spin rotational symmetric backscattering terms between right and left movers are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{hop} &\sim |t| \cdot \Big[\cos(2\phi_1 + C_1) + \cos(2\phi_2 + C_2) \Big], \\ \mathcal{H}_{pair} &\sim \mathrm{Re}\Delta \cdot \cos(\phi_1 - \phi_2) + \mathrm{Im}\Delta \cdot \sin(\phi_1 - \phi_2). \end{aligned}$$

where C_1, C_2 are constants. As discussed earlier they are forbidden by time reversal and mirror reflection symmetries.

VII. CONCLUSION AND OUTLOOK

In this work we systematically establish a connection between two different representations of Z_2 SLs, *i.e.* Schwinger-boson representation (bSR) and Abrikosov-fermion representation (fSR). In the presence of a symmetry group, projective symmetry groups (PSGs) are symmetry quantum numbers of the quasiparticle excitations in a Z_2 SL. We show that the vison symmetry quantum numbers can be detected by existence/absence of gapless edge modes and in-gap bound states localized at crystal defect in Z_2 SLs. Observing that there are no symmetry-protected edge modes or defect bound states in any Schwinger-boson state, and utilizing the relation between bosonic/fermionic spinon PSGs and vison PSGs, a correspondence between Schwinger-boson states and Abrikosov-fermion states is fully achieved. Applying this general framework to kagome lattice Z_2 SLs, we showed that all 8 distinct Schwinger-boson (bSR) states have their counterparts in Abrikosov-fermion (fSR) representation. In particular we found that two energetically favorable states, $Q_1 = Q_2$ Schwinger-boson state[28] and $Z_2[0,\pi]\beta$ state[38], in fact belong to the same spin liquid phase in proximity to $q = 0$ non-collinear magnetic order. We argue that this phase is the most promising candidate for the observed Z_2 SL ground state in kagome Heisenberg model.

Note, we have implicitly assumed that the topological order of Z_2 SLs is the same as that of the deconfined Z_2 gauge theory, based on the measured topological entanglement entropy of $\gamma = \log 2$. However, a distinct topological order, the double semion theory[62,63], which is a twisted version of the Z_2 gauge theory, also yields the same γ. While there is no direct evidence to support such a twisted Z_2 theory (in contrast to the energetic arguments for Z_2 spin liquids), it would be interesting in future to investigate candidate states.

With this connection in hand, we can potentially have a full understanding of the possible proximate phases and quantum phase transitions out of a Z_2 SL. It is well-known that the Schwinger-boson approach allows one to identify quantum phase transitions (QPT) into neighboring magnetic-ordered phases from a Z_2 SL, though condensation of bosonic spinons[28]. Meanwhile, knowing the vison PSGs one can study possible QPTs between paramagnetic valence-bond-solid (VBS) phases and Z_2 SLs. On the other hand, in fSR it's straightforward to track down gapless phases connected to a Z_2 SL through a phase transition, as well as proximate superconducting ground states upon doping a quantum SL[64]. Therefore the identification between fSR and bSR can lead to a full phase diagram around a gapped Z_2 SL.

The correspondence obtained here also serves as important guidance towards a complete specification of the Z_2 spin liquid on the kagome lattice. If one of the two promising states we identified is indeed the ground state, then that provides a clear target for future studies to look for "smoking gun" signatures of these two states. Finally, we point out that similar studies can be applied to Z_2 SLs on the square lattice[17,18], which we leave for future work.

Acknowledgments

We thank M. Hermele, Y. Ran, C. Xu, Y.B Kim, T. Grover, M. Lawler, P. Hosur, F. Wang, S. White, T. Senthil, P.A. Lee, D.N Sheng and S. Sachdev for helpful discussions. We thank Mike Zaletel for penetrating comments and for collaborations on a related paper[78]. GYC thanks Joel E. Moore for support and encouragement during this work. YML is indebted to Shenghan Jiang for pointing out a typo in TABLE I and for bringing Ref. 50 to our attention. The authors acknowledge support from Office of BES, Materials Sciences Division of the U.S. DOE under contract No. DE-AC02-05CH11231 (YML,AV), NSF DMR-1206515, DMR-1064319 and ICMT postdoctoral fellowship at UIUC (GYC) and in part from the National Science Foundation under Grant No. PHYS-1066293(YML). YML thanks Aspen Center for Physics for hospitality where part of the work is finished. GYC is especially thankful to M. Punk, Y. Huh and S. Sachdev for bringing Ref. 41 to our attention and for the helpful discussions and suggestions.

Appendix A: Deriving vison PSGs in TABLE I from edge states

In this section we explicitly show how to determine the vison PSGs in the last column of TABLE I. First of all we can always choose a proper gauge by multiplying a proper ± 1 sign to symmetry actions $T_{1,2}$, so that

$$T_2 R_{\pi/3} = R_{\pi/3} T_1, \quad T_1 R_{\pi/3} = R_{\pi/3} T_2^{-1} T_1. \tag{A1}$$

In other words both the 2nd and 3rd rows of TABLE I are $+1$. Meanwhile as discussed in the end of section III, we have

$$T_1 T_2 = -T_2 T_1. \tag{A2}$$

for visons in a spin-1/2 Z_2 SL on kagome lattice.

The absence of symmetry protected edge states along X-edge leads to conditions (13). In particular we have

$$T_1^{-1} T^{-1} T_1 T = 1,$$
$$R_x^2 = (R_{\pi/3} R_y)^2 = 1.$$

and

$$R_x^{-1} T^{-1} R_x T = (R_{\pi/3}^{-1} T^{-1} R_{\pi/3} T) \cdot (R_y^{-1} T^{-1} R_y T) = 1.$$

and

$$T_1 R_x^{-1} T_1 R_x = (T_1^{-1} T_2 R_y^{-1} T_2 R_y) \cdot (T_2^{-1} T_1^{-1} T_2 T_1)$$
$$= -T_1^{-1} T_2 R_y^{-1} T_2 R_y = 1.$$

At the same time, conditions (14) come from the absence of protected edge states along Y-edge. Therefore we have

$$R_y^2 = R_y^{-1} T^{-1} R_y T = 1. \tag{A3}$$

and

$$T_1^{-1} T_2^2 R_y^{-1} T_1^{-1} T_2^2 R_y =$$
$$(T_1^{-1} R_y^{-1} T_1 R_y) \cdot (T_2^{-1} T_1^{-1} T_2 T_1) = -T_1^{-1} R_y^{-1} T_1 R_y = 1.$$

These conditions fix all the vison PSGs except for $(R_{\pi/3})^6$ and $T_2^{-1} T^{-1} T_2 T$. The latter one is easily determined as

$$T_2^{-1} T^{-1} T_2 T = 1. \tag{A4}$$

by the absence of protected edge states in a cylinder whose edges are parallel to the direction of translation T_2. As discussed in section III, $(R_{\pi/3})^6 = 1$ is determined by the absence of protected mid-gap states in a disclination.

Appendix B: Vison PSGs obtained by explicit calculations[41]

In this section we deduce the vison PSGs from the dual frustrated Ising model obtained in Ref. 41, which describes vison fluctuations of Schwinger-boson Z_2 SLs on kagome lattice. The 4-component vison modes $\{v_n|1 \leq n \leq 4\}$ in section III A of Ref. 41 transform under symmetry g as

$$v_m \xrightarrow{g} \sum_{n=1}^{4} v_n \cdot \left[O_\phi(g)\right]_{n,m} \tag{B1}$$

where the matrices $\{O_\phi(g)\}$ are given by

$$O_\phi(T_1) = -\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{B2}$$

$$O_\phi(T_2) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{B3}$$

$$O_\phi(R_y) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{B4}$$

$$O_\phi(R_{\pi/3}) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{B5}$$

Note that Ref. 41 considers mirror reflection $I_x = R_{\pi/3}R_y$ with

$$O_\phi(I_x) = O_\phi(R_{\pi/3})O_\phi(R_y) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$$

It's straightforward to check the vison PSGs

$$\begin{aligned}
&O_\phi(T_1)O_\phi(T_2)O_\phi(T_1)^{-1}O_\phi(T_2)^{-1} = -1;\\
&O_\phi(R_{\pi/3})^{-1}O_\phi(T_1)O_\phi(R_{\pi/3})O_\phi(T_2) = 1;\\
&O_\phi(R_{\pi/3})^{-1}O_\phi(T_2)O_\phi(R_{\pi/3})O_\phi(T_2)^{-1}O_\phi(T_1) = 1;\\
&O_\phi(T_1)O_\phi(T_2)^{-1}O_\phi(R_y)O_\phi(T_2)^{-1}O_\phi(R_y)^{-1} = -1;\\
&O_\phi(T_1)O_\phi(R_y)O_\phi(T_1)^{-1}O_\phi(R_y)^{-1} = -1;\\
&O_\phi(R_{\pi/3})^6 = 1\\
&O_\phi(R_y)^2 = 1\\
&O_\phi(R_{\pi/3})O_\phi(R_y)O_\phi(R_{\pi/3})O_\phi^{-1}(R_y) = 1
\end{aligned} \tag{B6}$$

which agree with the last column of TABLE I.

Appendix C: Two-dimensional TRI singlet superconductors (Class CI) with mirror reflection symmetry

In this section we discuss possible symmetry-protected edge states of a time-reversal-invariant (TRI) singlet superconductor with mirror reflection symmetry in two dimensions. In a cylinder geometry, the symmetry group is generated by translation T_e along the open edge (or cylinder circumference), mirror reflection R, time reversal T and $SU(2)$ spin rotations. Without loss of generality, let's assume that $SU(2)$ spin rotations commute with all other symmetries $\{T, T_e, R\}$. We further assume that translation T_e acts as

$$T_e^{-1}T^{-1}T_eT = T_eR^{-1}T_3R = +1. \tag{C1}$$

for fermions.

1. Classification

Since translation T_e has trivial commutation relation with other symmetry operations, it can be disentangled from the full symmetry group. Are there any gapless edge states protected by translation symmetry? This corresponds to "weak index"[65] of 2d topological superconductors in class CI (with time reversal and $SU(2)$ spin rotations), which is nothing but 1d topological index of the same symmetry class. Class CI has trivial classification (0) in 1d, therefore we don't have translation-protected edge states. Due to absence of 2d topological index in class CI, any protected edge states must come from mirror reflection symmetry R. The classification of mirror reflection protected topological insulators/superconductors is resolved in Ref. 66,67 in the framework of K-theory[68]. The classification of non-interacting topological phases of fermions in class CI with mirror reflection R depends on the commutation relation

$$R^2 = s_1, \quad R^{-1}T^{-1}RT = s_2; \quad s_i = \pm 1. \tag{C2}$$

with time reversal T. When $s_1 = s_2 = +1$, the K-theory classification is given by $\pi_0(R_6) = 0$, *i.e.* no topological superconductors with protected edge states. When $s_1 = s_2 = -1$, the classification is $\pi_0(C_5) = 0$ *i.e.* no topological superconductors. When $s_1 = +1, s_2 = -1$ the classification is $\left[\pi_0(R_5)\right]^2 = 0^2 = 0$ *i.e.* no topological superconductors. Only when

$$s_1 = -1, \quad s_2 = +1. \tag{C3}$$

the classification is given by $\pi_0(R_4) = \mathbb{Z}$ and there are topological superconductors with an integer index ($\mathbb{Z}$).

2. Minimal Dirac model and protected edge states

Here we construct a Dirac model for the root state ($\nu = 1$) of topological superconductors with integer index $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}$ and mirror reflection R satisfying

$$R^2 = -1, \quad RT = TR. \tag{C4}$$

Writing spin-1/2 electrons in the Nambu basis $\psi_k \equiv (c_{k,\uparrow}, c^\dagger_{-k,\downarrow})^T$, we use Pauli matrices $\vec{\tau}$ for Nambu index and $\vec{\mu}, \vec{\rho}$ for orbital index. The 8-band massless Dirac Hamiltonian is given by

$$H_{Dirac} = \sum_k (k_x \mu_x + k_y \mu_z)\rho_y \tau_x \tag{C5}$$

The Dirac fermion transforms as

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_k &\xrightarrow{T} \mathrm{i}\tau_y \psi_k^*, \\ \psi_{(k_x,k_y)} &\xrightarrow{R} \mathrm{i}\mu_x \rho_y \psi_{(k_x,-k_y)} \end{aligned} \tag{C6}$$

The only symmetry-allowed mass term is

$$M = \tau_z \tag{C7}$$

Now let's create a mass domain wall across an open edge at $x = 0$ along y-axis. The gapless edge states is captured by zero-energy solution of differential equation

$$-\mathrm{i}\partial_x \mu_x \rho_y \tau_x + m(x)\tau_z = 0, \quad m(x) = |m(x)| \cdot \mathrm{Sgn}(x)$$

which is $|edge\rangle \sim e^{-\int_0^x m(\lambda)\mathrm{d}\lambda} |\mu_x \rho_y \tau_y = +1\rangle$. Therefore $\rho_y = \mu_x \tau_y$ for the protected gapless edge modes, localized on the edge between the root topological superconductor and the vacuum. The Hamiltonian for the protected edge states is given by

$$H_k = k_y \mu_z \rho_y \tau_x \to -k_y \mu_y \tau_z \tag{C8}$$

Apparently there are 4 gapless modes: 2 right movers and 2 left movers. It's straightforward to simplify such edge states to the form in section VI C.

Appendix D: $Z_2[0,\pi]\beta$ mean-field state and its proximate phases

We begin by revisiting $U(1)$ Dirac spin liquid[35,69,70] and $Z_2[0,\pi]\beta$ state[38] and on a kagome lattice. The spin liquid states are proposed to be the ground state of nearest-neighbor spin-1/2 Heisenberg model on kagome lattice:

$$H = J \sum_{<ij>} \hat{S}_i \cdot \hat{S}_j \tag{D1}$$

The low-energy theory of the $U(1)$ Dirac spin liquid[70] is described by a 8-component spinor ψ of fermionic spinons in Dirac spectrum and a strongly fluctuating $U(1)$ gauge field a_μ:

$$H = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \psi^\dagger_{\mathbf{k}} \sigma^0 \mu^0 (\tau_x k_x + \tau_y k_y) \psi_{\mathbf{k}}. \tag{D2}$$

where τ^ν, σ^ν and μ^ν are the Pauli matrices acting on Dirac, spin and valley indices of $\psi_{\mathbf{k}}$ (there are two nodes or two "valleys" : hence $\psi_{\mathbf{k}}$ is a 8-component spinor). Here we temporarily ignore the compact $U(1)$ gauge theory for clarity of discussion.

To obtain a Z_2 spin liquid from this $U(1)$ Dirac spin liquid, a BCS-type pairing term is introduced for the fermion ψ. We require the pairing term to be invariant under spin rotational symmetry, lattice symmetry operations (see Fig.1 for the symmetries of kagome lattice) and time-reversal symmetry, because the spin liquid found in DMRG study does not break any of the symmetries. Furthermore, the pairing should gap out the Dirac spectrum as the Z_2 spin liquid found numerically is fully gapped.

$$\delta H = \Delta \psi^\dagger (\sigma^y \mu^y \tau^y) \psi^* + h.c., \tag{D3}$$

which is a singlet of spin, valley and Dirac spinor indices. Being a singlet under spin and valley indices gaurantees that the pairing is invariant under spin rotational symmetry and lattice symmetry operations. The low-energy physics of $Z_2[0,\pi]\beta$ state is described by $H + \delta H$ in Eq.(D2) and Eq.(D3), *i.e.* a gapped singlet superconductor of fermionic spinons coupled to a dynamical Z_2 gauge field.

It is known that Dirac fermions are unstable (with sufficiently large interactions) to open up gap in various channels. Each channel is called a "mass" and is represented by a constant matrix in the Dirac spinor representation. For example in Dirac Hamiltonian (D2), $\tau^z \mu^\alpha \sigma^\beta$ are all mass terms, with $\alpha, \beta = 0, x, y, z$. For a 2+1-D Dirac fermion, when we can find five such mass matrices anti-commuting with each other[54,56,71], we obtain a non-linear sigma model supplemented with a topological WZW term[72,73] after integrating out *massive* fermions. This non-linear sigma model describes fluctuating order parameters of the Dirac fermions. Most importantly, the theory can describe a Landau-forbidden second-order transition between the two phases[74], where the transition is driven by condensing the topological defects[37,53,55,56]. The mass terms associated to the Z_2 spin liquid are real and imaginary parings in (D3).

Because we seek for the nearby phases of the Z_2 spin liquid, the relevant mass terms should anti-commute with the pairing term (D3) and the kinetic term (D2). We immediately find two $O(3)$ vector mass terms among 26 mass terms of the $U(1)$ Dirac spin liquid[70], anti-commuting with the pairing term (D3).

Among the two $O(3)$ vector mass terms, we consider only the $O(3)$ vector chirality operator[70] $\hat{V} \sim < \psi^\dagger \tau^z \vec{\sigma} \psi >$ to examine the magnetically ordered proximate phase of the $Z_2[0,\pi]\beta$ state. The operator $\hat{V}$ is

spin-triplet and time-reversal symmetric. This order parameter represents the sum of the vector chirality around honeycomb plaquette H on Kagome lattice.

$$\hat{V}^a \sim \sum_{<ij>\in H} (\vec{S}_i \times \vec{S}_j)^a, \tag{D4}$$

Because the vector chirality $\hat{V}$ is spin-triplet, we expect the non-linear sigma model for the unit $O(5)$ vector $= (\Delta_x, \Delta_y, \hat{V})$ to describe the transition between the spin liquid and a magnetically ordered phase with the non-zero $\langle \hat{V} \rangle$.

To see this, we approach the critical point between the spin liquid and the magnetically ordered phase from the ordered phase. The low-energy effective theory for the symmetry-broken phase, including the compact $U(1)$ gauge field a_μ, is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L} = \psi^\dagger \sigma^0 \mu^0 \tau^\mu \cdot (\mathrm{i}\partial_\mu + a_\mu)\psi + m\hat{V} \cdot \psi^\dagger \tau^z \vec{\sigma} \psi \\ + \frac{1}{g^2}(\partial_\mu \vec{V})^2 + \frac{1}{2\tilde{e}^2}(\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda}\partial_\nu a_\lambda)^2 + \cdots\end{aligned} \tag{D5}$$

In the symmetry-broken phase, the $O(3)$ vector order parameter $\hat{V}$ develops a finite expectation value, and we assume $\langle \hat{V} \rangle = (0, 0, 1)$ without losing generality (other direction of $\langle \hat{V} \rangle$ can be generated by the spin rotations). With the expectation value $\hat{V}$, it is not difficult to see that the spin-up fermions and the spin-down fermions have an energy gap $|m|$ at the Dirac points with the opposite sign, and the mass gap consequently generates the "spin Hall effect" for the fermions. The quantum spin Hall effect has an important implication[75] on the fate of the compact gauge field a_μ: it ties the gauge fluctuation to the spin fluctuation, and thus the Goldstone mode ($\sim$ spin fluctuation) of the spin ordered phase becomes a photon ($\sim$ gauge fluctuation) of a_μ. This implies that the gauge field a_μ is in the Coulomb phase and the photon of a_μ is free to propagate. Hence there are three Goldstone modes in the magnetically ordered phase, one photon mode from the non-compact $U(1)$ guage field a_μ and two Goldstone modes from the ordering of the $O(3)$ vector $\hat{V}$. Meanwhile accompanying the proliferation of a_μ photons, fermionic spinons will be confined[76] due to instanton effect of 2+1-D $U(1)$ gauge theory. Therefore indeed it is a non-collinear magnetic ordered phase with three Goldstone modes, which does not support fractionalized excitations.

Upon integrating out the massive Dirac fermion, we obtain the effective theory[37,54] for the fluctuating $\hat{V}$ in the presence of the gauge field a_μ

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{g^2}(\partial_\mu \hat{V})^2 + 2a_\mu J^\mu_{skyr} + \frac{1}{2\tilde{e}^2}(\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda}\partial_\nu a_\lambda)^2 + \cdots \tag{D6}$$

where J^μ_{skyr} is the skyrmion current of $\hat{V}$, e.g. $J^0_{skyr} \propto \hat{V} \cdot (\partial_x \hat{V} \times \partial_y \hat{V})$ is the skyrmion density of $\hat{V}$. From the coupling between J^μ_{skyr} and a_μ, it is clear that the skyrmion carries the charge-2 of the gauge field a_μ. Hence, condensing the skyrmion of $\hat{V}$ breaks $U(1)$ gauge group down to Z_2 and the skyrmion can be thought as the pairing $\sim \langle \psi^\dagger \psi^\dagger \rangle$ of the fermionic spinons ψ in (D2). As the condensation of the skyrmion would destroy the ordering in $\hat{V}$ and induce the pairing between the fermionic spinons, we will enter the Z_2 spin liquid phase next to the symmetry-broken phase, *i.e.* $Z_2[0, \pi]\beta$ state.

Thus we have established that the magnetically ordered phase next to the $Z_2[0, \pi]\beta$ state is a non-collinear magnetically ordered phase with the non-zero vector chirality at $q = 0$. Given that the $q = 0$ magnetically ordered state is also a non-collinear magnetically ordered phase with the non-zero vector chirality at $q = 0$, the $Z_2[0, \pi]\beta$ state is a natural candidate for the Z_2 SL proximate to the $q = 0$ magnetically ordered state.

[1] F. Wilczek, *Fractional Statistics and Anyon Superconductivity* (World Scientific Pub Co Inc, Singapore, 1990).
[2] N. Read and S. Sachdev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 1773 (1991).
[3] X. G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **44**, 2664 (1991).
[4] R. A. Jalabert and S. Sachdev, Phys. Rev. B **44**, 686 (1991).
[5] C. Mudry and E. Fradkin, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 5200 (1994).
[6] T. Senthil and M. P. A. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 7850 (2000).
[7] A. Y. Kitaev, Annals of Physics **303**, 2 (2003), ISSN 0003-4916.
[8] J. B. Kogut, Rev. Mod. Phys. **51**, 659 (1979).
[9] S. Yan, D. A. Huse, and S. R. White, Science **332**, 1173 (2011).
[10] H.-C. Jiang, Z. Wang, and L. Balents, Nat Phys **8**, 902 (2012), ISSN 1745-2473.
[11] S. Depenbrock, I. P. McCulloch, and U. Schollwöck, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 067201 (2012).
[12] R. Suttner, C. Platt, J. Reuther, and R. Thomale, Phys. Rev. B **89**, 020408 (2014).
[13] A. Kitaev and J. Preskill, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 110404 (2006).
[14] M. Levin and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 110405 (2006).
[15] L. D. Landau, Phys. Z. Sowjetunion **11**, 26 (1937).
[16] X.-G. Wen, *Quantum Field Theory Of Many-body Systems: From The Origin Of Sound To An Origin Of Light And Electrons* (Oxford University Press, New York, 2004).
[17] L. Wang, Z.-C. Gu, F. Verstraete, and X.-G. Wen, ArXiv e-prints 1112.3331 (2011).

[18] H.-C. Jiang, H. Yao, and L. Balents, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 024424 (2012).
[19] J. S. Helton, K. Matan, M. P. Shores, E. A. Nytko, B. M. Bartlett, Y. Yoshida, Y. Takano, A. Suslov, Y. Qiu, J.-H. Chung, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 107204 (2007).
[20] X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 165113 (2002).
[21] L.-Y. Hung and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 165107 (2013).
[22] A. Mesaros and Y. Ran, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 155115 (2013).
[23] A. M. Essin and M. Hermele, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 104406 (2013).
[24] Y. Hu, Y. Wan, and Y.-S. Wu, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 125114 (2013).
[25] Y.-M. Lu and A. Vishwanath, ArXiv e-prints 1302.2634 (2013).
[26] L.-Y. Hung and Y. Wan, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 195103 (2013).
[27] D. P. Arovas and A. Auerbach, Phys. Rev. B **38**, 316 (1988).
[28] S. Sachdev, Phys. Rev. B **45**, 12377 (1992).
[29] F. Wang and A. Vishwanath, Phys. Rev. B **74**, 174423 (2006).
[30] A. A. Abrikosov, Physics **2**, 5 (1965).
[31] G. Baskaran, Z. Zou, and P. W. Anderson, Solid State Communications **63**, 973 (1987), ISSN 0038-1098.
[32] I. Affleck and J. B. Marston, Phys. Rev. B **37**, 3774 (1988).
[33] I. Affleck, Z. Zou, T. Hsu, and P. W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. B **38**, 745 (1988).
[34] T. Tay and O. I. Motrunich, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 020404 (2011).
[35] Y. Ran, M. Hermele, P. A. Lee, and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 117205 (2007).
[36] Y. Iqbal, F. Becca, and D. Poilblanc, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 020407 (2011).
[37] Y.-M. Lu and Y. Ran, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 024420 (2011).
[38] Y.-M. Lu, Y. Ran, and P. A. Lee, Phys. Rev. B **83**, 224413 (2011).
[39] R. Moessner, S. L. Sondhi, and E. Fradkin, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 024504 (2001).
[40] X. Chen, Z.-C. Gu, Z.-X. Liu, and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 155114 (2013).
[41] Y. Huh, M. Punk, and S. Sachdev, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 094419 (2011).
[42] S.-P. Kou and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **80**, 224406 (2009).
[43] G. Y. Cho, Y.-M. Lu, and J. E. Moore, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 125101 (2012).
[44] S.-P. Kou, M. Levin, and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **78**, 155134 (2008).
[45] S. B. Bravyi and A. Y. Kitaev, eprint arXiv:quant-ph/9811052 (1998), arXiv:quant-ph/9811052.
[46] E. Kroner and K. H. Anthony, Annu. Rev. Mater. Sci. **5**, 43 (1975), ISSN 0084-6600.
[47] M. Kleman and J. Friedel, Rev. Mod. Phys. **80**, 61 (2008).
[48] A. Auerbach, *Interacting electrons and quantum magnetism*, Graduate Texts in Contemporary Physics (Springer, New York, 1994).
[49] C. Gros, Annals of Physics **189**, 53 (1989), ISSN 0003-4916.
[50] F. Yang and H. Yao, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 147209 (2012).
[51] S. Yan, D. A. Huse, and S. R. White, Bulletin of the American Physical Society (2012).
[52] A. V. Chubukov, S. Sachdev, and T. Senthil, Nuclear Physics B **426**, 601 (1994), ISSN 0550-3213.
[53] T. Grover and T. Senthil, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 156804 (2008).
[54] A. G. Abanov and P. B. Wiegmann, Nuclear Physics B **570**, 685 (2000), ISSN 0550-3213.
[55] A. Tanaka and X. Hu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 036402 (2005).
[56] T. Senthil and M. P. A. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B **74**, 064405 (2006).
[57] M. Z. Hasan and C. L. Kane, Rev. Mod. Phys. **82**, 3045 (2010).
[58] M. Z. Hasan and J. E. Moore, Annu. Rev. Condens. Matter Phys. **2**, 55 (2011), ISSN 1947-5454.
[59] X.-L. Qi and S.-C. Zhang, Rev. Mod. Phys. **83**, 1057 (2011).
[60] M. Levin and A. Stern, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 115131 (2012).
[61] Y.-M. Lu and A. Vishwanath, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 125119 (2012).
[62] M. Freedman, C. Nayak, K. Shtengel, K. Walker, and Z. Wang, Annals of Physics **310**, 428 (2004), ISSN 0003-4916.
[63] M. A. Levin and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **71**, 045110 (2005).
[64] P. A. Lee, N. Nagaosa, and X.-G. Wen, Rev. Mod. Phys. **78**, 17 (2006).
[65] Y. Ran, ArXiv e-prints 1006.5454 (2010), 1006.5454.
[66] C.-K. Chiu, H. Yao, and S. Ryu, Phys. Rev. B **88**, 075142 (2013).
[67] T. Morimoto and A. Furusaki, Phys. Rev. B **88**, 125129 (2013).
[68] A. Kitaev, AIP Conf. Proc. **1134**, 22 (2009).
[69] M. B. Hastings, Phys. Rev. B **63**, 014413 (2000).
[70] M. Hermele, Y. Ran, P. A. Lee, and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **77**, 224413 (2008).
[71] S. Ryu, C. Mudry, C.-Y. Hou, and C. Chamon, Phys. Rev. B **80**, 205319 (2009).
[72] J. Wess and B. Zumino, Physics Letters B **37**, 95 (1971), ISSN 0370-2693.
[73] E. Witten, Nuclear Physics B **223**, 422 (1983), ISSN 0550-3213.
[74] T. Senthil, L. Balents, S. Sachdev, A. Vishwanath, and M. P. A. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B **70**, 144407 (2004).
[75] Y. Ran, A. Vishwanath, and D.-H. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 086801 (2008).
[76] A. M. Polyakov, Nuclear Physics B **120**, 429 (1977), ISSN 0550-3213.
[77] Yang Qi and Liang Fu, to appear.
[78] Mike Zaletel, Yuan-Ming Lu, Ashvin Vishwanath, to appear.
[79] In this work we will focus on a spin-1/2 system, though generalizations to higher spins are straightforward.